

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/673,951	10/24/2000	Eugenie Charriere	004900-188	8720
21839 75	590 02/18/2005		EXAMINER	
BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P POST OFFICE BOX 1404			SERGENT, RABON A	
	A, VA 22313-1404		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
	•		1711	
			DATE MAILED: 02/18/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/673,951	CHARRIERE ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Rabon Sergent	1711	•			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addre	ss			
THE REPLY FILED 28 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.				
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amend condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The product for the prior to the fire the prior to file the prior to the prior to file the prior	ment, affidavit, or other evidence, wal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR or ereply must be filed within one of t	which places the applica 41.31; or (3) a Request	ation in for Continued			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
	b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE					
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	• •	00(-)				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropriate inally set in the final Office	e extension fee action; or (2) a			
2. The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on 28 January 2005. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).						
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bel 	•	ducina or cimplifyina the	o iccuso for			
appeal; and/or	ter lorin for appear by materially re	ducing or simplifying the	3 155UES 101			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.				
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13	* **	mpliant Amendment (P	TOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	:		•			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wil vided below or appended.	l be entered and an exp	lanation of			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>24-58</u> .			-			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			•			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	to provide a			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		·				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.			e because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)				
13. Other:		Rabon Sergent Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1711	+			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 9-04) Continuation of 3.: The proposed amendments pertaining to the use of certain alcohols set forth limitations not previously claimed. Their entry would require further consideration and search.

Continuation of 11.: The rejections set forth within paragraphs 1 and 2 of the final Office action have been maintained for the reasons previously set forth. With respect to the rejection set forth within paragraph 2 of the final Office action, the rejection has been applied to all claims, because applicants' position regarding the meaning of "derived isocyanate function" calls into question the meaning of any claimed isocyanate composition. As set forth within the final Office action, it is unclear if any of applicants' isocyanate compositions are required to contain any actual isocyanate groups. The prior art rejections have been maintained, because applicants' arguments appear to be largely based upon amendments that will not be entered. Furthermore, applicants' test data is of no probative value. The test data is not in the form of a declaration and no meaningful statement of its relevance to the instant claims or its scope relative to the instant claims has been provided. The test data is deficient with respect to content and explanation to such an extent that no meaningful evidence demonstrating that the use of the argued alcohols yields an unexpected result can be attributed to the data.

RABON SERGENT BEIMARY FXAMINER